IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No. 7497 of 1995
With
CIVIL APPLICATION No. 10443 of 2006
In
SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No. 7497 of 1995

For Approval and Signature:

HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.R.BRAHMBHATT

==========

1 Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?

2 To be referred to the Reporter or not ?

3 Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?

4 Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder ?

5 Whether it is to be circulated to the civil judge ?

==========

ARUNABEN V GADE & 2 - Petitioners
Versus
STATE OF GUJARAT & 1 - Respondents

==========

Appearance :
MR SHASHIKANT S GADE for Petitioners : 1 - 3.
MR KETAN DWIVEDI AGP for Respondents : 1,
RULE SERVED BY DS for Respondent(s) : 1 - 2.

==========

CORAM : HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.R.BRAHMBHATT

Date : 01/08/2007

COMMON ORAL JUDGMENT

1. Shri Gade, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners is not pressing this petition so far

as petitioner No. 2. Therefore now this petition is only confine to petitioner No. 1.

2. Shri Gade, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has in fact worked for requisite number of days as Badli Worker and therefore, she ought to have been given the employment as and when there is vacancy. Shri Gade submits that she will make representation to the respondent authorities within one month from today and respondents be directed to decide the same in accordance with law.

3. Shri Gade's request appears to be reasonable and therefore, the respondents are hereby directed to dispose of the representation that may be made by petitioner No. 1 within one month on merits and in accordance with law taking into consideration the record with regard to her actual service as Badli Worker. The representation will be decided within two months from the date of receipt of the representation by the respondent authorities.

4. In view of the aforesaid direction, Shri Gade, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw this petition. The request is granted. The petition is dismissed as withdrawn with aforesaid direction. Rule is discharged. There shall be no order as to costs.

5. In view of the order passed in Special Civil Application No. 7497 of 1995, the Civil Application No. 10443 of 2006 does not survive and the same is disposed of as not survive.

(S.R.BRAHMBHATT, J.)

pallav